REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-53 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 11, 21, 32, 42, 43, 46, and 53 have been amended.

The Examiner rejected claims 46 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended Claim 46 to overcome the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, have been overcome by the amendments and the remarks and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-10, 21-33, 35-36, and 38-42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "User Interface Markup Language (UIML) Draft Specification Document Version 17", Harmonia, Inc., in view of Ikemoto (US 5,969,717). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 of the present invention sets forth a method of dynamically adapting a presentation in which a set of platform independent graphical user interface components are arranged and used to create a device platform dependent presentation by selectively transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application. This is particularly useful in allowing software to present information to devices having an arbitrarily sized display.

Neither Harmonia nor Ikemoto disclose the features discussed above with respect to Claim 1. As admitted by the Examiner, Harmonia does not disclose selectively transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application. Therefore, Harmonia does not disclose creating a device platform dependent

presentation by selectively transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application.

Ikemoto also does not disclose creating a device platform dependent presentation by selectively transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application. Ikemoto does disclose a layout processing unit 5 that calculates the position of data items on a graphical user interface (GUI) display screen for which a GUI component has been selected and lays out the GUI component in a window. To that end, the layout processing unit determines the size and position of the GUI component allocated to each data item. The layout processing unit sets the size of the GUI components by adding pixel amounts to the size of the GUI component, typically by adding to the height and width of such a component. Once sized, the layout processing unit positions the window. That is, the layout processing unit determines the display position.

The Examiner cited column 11, lines 14-33 of Ikemoto. Importantly, this portion of Ikemoto discusses positioning the window in the top left of the display screen with respect to top and left margins. This clearly implies that the window is not the maximum fill of a display screen. In fact, the portion of Ikemoto discloses that the sizing of the window itself is done by adding a predetermined number of pixels to the height and width to the size of the display area of all the components that are included. Such predetermined amounts along with the implicit location of the window to a portion of the display screen is clearly not the same as creating a device platform dependent presentation in which the size of the page is adjusted to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application. Therefore, the combination of Harmonia and Ikemoto does not disclose all the

limitations of Claim 1. Similar limitations are also found in the other independent claims. In view of this, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as claimed is not obvious in view of Harmonia and Ikemoto.

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 11-20, 34, and 43-53 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "User Interface Markup Language (UIML) Draft Specification Document Version 17," Harmonia, Inc., in view of Ikemoto (US 5,969,717) as applied to claims 1 and 32 above, and further in view of Kashiwagi (US 6,037,939). As discussed above, Harmonia and Ikemoto do not disclose creating a device platform dependent presentation by selectively transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application. Kashiwagi does not overcome that deficiency. Kashiwagi discloses an interaction tool that allows for interactive manipulation of data, not creating a device platform dependent presentation by selectively transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application. Therefore, the combination of Harmonia, Ikemoto and Kashiwagi does not disclose all the limitations of Claims 3, 11-20, 34, and 43-53. In view of this, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as claimed is not obvious in view of Harmonia, Ikemoto and Kashiwagi.

The Examiner rejected claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "User Interface Markup Language (UIML) Draft Specification Document Version 17", Harmonia, Inc., in view of Ikemoto (US 5,969,717) as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of Orr (US 5,895,477). As discussed above, Harmonia and Ikemoto do not disclose creating a device platform dependent presentation by selectively transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of

one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application. Orr does not overcome that deficiency. Orr discloses dropping content objects onto a composition, not creating a device platform dependent presentation by selectively transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application. Therefore, the combination of Harmonia, Ikemoto and Orr does not disclose all the limitations of Claim 37. In view of this, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as claimed is not obvious in view of Harmonia, Ikemoto and Orr.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been overcome by the amendments and the remarks and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that Claims 1-53 as amended are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: _____ 7/h___, 2005

Michael J. Mallie
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8598